

DEC 01 2004

The cited art does not teach or suggest a processor coupled to a plurality of measurement devices, each of which is coupled to at least one of a plurality of process tools.

Moore teaches a measurement apparatus coupled to a cluster tool. However, Moore does not teach or suggest a plurality of measurement devices, each of which is coupled to at least one of a plurality of process tools. In addition, Maris, Tanimoto, and Kuriyama do not teach or suggest a measurement device that is coupled to a process tool. As such, Maris, Tanimoto, and Kuriyama cannot be combined with Moore to overcome deficiencies therein. Furthermore, there is no teaching, suggestion or motivation to modify the prior art systems to include the claimed processor or the claimed plurality of measurement devices, or to combine the cited art with any other reference to teach or suggest these limitations. Claim 1496 is therefore patentable over the cited art, and rejection of claim 1496 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is asserted to be erroneous.

#### **IX. CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1413-1439, 1441-1445, 1447-1500, 1583, 1688, 1709, and 1751 was erroneous, and reversal of the Examiner's decision is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the required fee(s) to Daffar McDaniel LLP Deposit Account No. 50-3268/5589-02305.

Respectfully submitted,



Ann Marie Mowherter  
Reg. No. 50,484  
Agent for Appellant

Daffar McDaniel LLP  
P.O. Box 684908  
Austin, TX 78768-4908  
Date: December 1, 2004